DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 078 RC 015 568

AUTHOR Graham, DeDe
TITLE Migrant Education and the Upward Social Mobility of Migrant Students.
INSTITUTION Snyder Public Schools, OK.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Attainment; Elementary Secondary Education; Mexican Americans; *Migrant Education; *Migrant Programs; Migrants; *Occupational Aspiration; Parent Attitudes; Questionnaires; *Social Mobility; *Socioeconomic Background; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Impact; *Oklahoma (Snyder)

ABSTRACT

Findings from interviews with 10 migrant parents, 10 migrant students, 4 regular teachers, 2 migrant teachers, and 2 migrant aides indicate that the Migrant Education Program has a positive effect on the upward social mobility of migrant students in Snyder, Oklahoma, a farming/ranching community of 2,500 with a migrant student enrollment comprising from 5% to 28% of the student population from 1974 to 1984. Evidence suggests that adequate school resources, a hospitable school climate, and sensitivity of school staff to migrant students' background characteristics may be critical in optimizing their school achievement. The interviews document that migrant students surpassed the educational levels of their parents and projected higher incomes and occupational levels than their parents. Parents appeared to emphasize and encourage acculturation of their children into the mainstream of society, with 80% indicating they did not desire a bilingual instructional program. Migrant teachers' educational expectations for migrant students were consistently higher than those of regular teachers. This higher level of expectation could be based on closer interaction with students, smaller classes, individualized instruction, extensive contact with parents, awareness of migrant students' background characteristics, and/or a special empathy and rapport with these students. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED264078

Migrant Education and the Upward Social Mobility of Migrant Students

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DeDe Graham
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DeDe Graham, Administrator
Snyder Public Schools
Snyder, Oklahoma

1984

RC015568

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....1

II. Review of the Literature.....4

III. Interview Tables.....13

IV. Summary.....19

V. Appendix.....26

VI. Footnotes.....29

VII. Bibliography.....32

Migrant Education and the

Upward Social Mobility of Migrant Students

The issue of "Does Migrant Education have an effect on the upward social mobility of migrant students?" is investigated in this paper. This investigation was accomplished by conducting 10 parent interviews, 10 student interviews, four regular teacher, two migrant teacher, and two migrant teacher aide interviews at the Snyder Public School District in Snyder, Oklahoma.

In this study social class is defined as a division of people in society who have relatively similar backgrounds with respect to wealth (income), education, and occupational status.[1] The economic income levels are based on a 1982 statewide survey done by The Oklahoma Poll located in Tulsa, Oklahoma.[2] The over $40,000--is upper-middle class; $25,000-$39,999--is lower-middle class; $15,000-$24,999--is upper-lower class; and under $15,000 is lower-lower class. These four categories are based on Warner's Theory of Social Class Structure.[3] Small towns and villages are often found to have only four social classes. In fact, Bressler states that the highest social class present in the small towns and rural areas across the United States is often the upper-middle class.[4]

The community utilized in this investigation is located at the intersection of Highway 183 and Highway 62 in southwestern Oklahoma. A population of 2500, predominantly farmers and ranchers, live here. The primary income in the area is derived from the production of agricultural products principally wheat, cotton, and cattle.

The Snyder Public Schools constitute the largest industry in the town with 61 employees and an operating budget of $1,274,222.71. The school is also the center for most of the social and recreational activities of the community.

Since 1982, when the Mountain Park School District annexed to the Snyder District the students of Snyder Schools have been educated in three separate facilities. The headstart, kindergarten, and first grade students attend classes in a Primary Building located in Mountain Park (three miles north of Snyder), grades three through nine attend classes in the Grade-Junior High Building with grades 10 through 12 in the High School facility.

Due to the community's overwhelming dependence on agriculture, many migrant farm workers and their children live in Snyder. Because of this large percentage of migrant farm workers, the Snyder Public Schools operate one of the largest Migrant Education Programs in the state of Oklahoma. This is evidenced by the enrollment figures for the school system since 1974 when the Migrant Education Program was

begun in the Snyder Schools. The migrant student enrollment has consisted of between five and 28% percent of the total student population during these years. (See Appendix).

Review of the Literature

According to the Bureau of the Census (United States Department of Commerce, May 1981), as of March 1980 there were about 13.2 million persons of Spanish origin in the United States. This figure amounts to approximately six to seven percent of the total United States population.[5] It has been projected that by the year 2000 the Hispanic population will be the largest minority group in key areas of the United States.[6]

As a whole, the United States population of Hispanics differs from the general population at large in a number of significant ways pertaining to socioeconomic welfare, age, language background, and educational attainment. In 1978, the median annual income for Hispanic families was $12,566 as compared to $17,912 for non-Hispanic families. The United States Hispanic population is young relative to the remainder of the population, with a median age in 1979 of 22.1 years versus a median age of 30.7 years for non-Hispanics.[7] According to the Survey of Income and Education (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, NCES, 1978b), three out of four United States Hispanics were born in the United States. Overall, four out of five United States Hispanics lived in Spanish-speaking households, and one out of three Hispanics usually spoke

Spanish. In 1976, only about 14% of United States Hispanics reported an English-only language background.[8]

The most current and comprehensive national overview of educational characteristics of United States Hispanics is provided in the report, "The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans," (United States Department of Education, NCES, 1980). This report states that the educational attainment among Hispanics lags far behind that of the population as a whole at all levels of schooling. In 1977, only 55.5% of Hispanics aged 18 to 34 years had completed high school, as compared to 83.9% of non-Hispanics of the same age range.[9]

Many of the members of this Hispanic population are migrant workers. It has been estimated that approximately one million people leave their homes each year to work as seasonal laborers in agriculture. A large percentage make their homes in south Texas, California, and Florida. From these home bases they stream northward following work and the harvest. Although some work only in their home state, the majority travel through, and are temporary residents, of many states. Therefore, it is relevant to explore what is being done to meet the educational needs of the children of this highly mobile segment of society and to investigate the effectiveness of these efforts.

Background

An example of a prevalent viewpoint concerning the children of migrant workers is expressed in the following quote.

> The vast majority of migrants are people of Mexican-American, Black, and Puerto Rican heritage. Children of these ethnic/racial groups are educationally deprived and isolated. Migrant children also suffer economic, cultural and social discrimination due to their high level of mobility and low socioeconomic status foisted upon them by the dominant more stable society. Value conflicts are frequent and should be self-evident. Migrant children frequently become third class baggage of second class citizens.[10]

In order to better understand their position, it is important to know what characteristics are displayed by the group as a whole. One study identified the following major cultural value clusters of Mexican-Americans: 1) identification with family, community, and ethnic group; 2) personalization of interpersonal relationships; 3) status and role definition in family and community; and 4) Mexican Catholic ideology.[11] Another study of migrants in the Southwest revealed the following traits:

1. Some 85% of the migrants were of Spanish-American ancestry.
2. The average family consisted of six children plus other related adults.
3. Family unity was very strong.
4. Migrants tended to seek employment for the total family, including older children.
5. Permanent homes, where existent, were generally inadequate with much overcrowding.
6. There were few unattached males in the population.
7. Migrant camps ranged from acceptable to deplorable.
8. Educational level was very low.

9. Their subculture was not easily compatible with "accepted" values.
10. Annual income was very low.
11. Migrants were not fervent about religion. They were not blindly subordinated to the clergy.
12. The strong family unit did not extend to relatives not in the immediate family.
13. Migrants were necessarily preoccupied with making a living.
14. They were very "present" time oriented.
15. Migrants tended to be very passive.
16. Contentment seemed to prevail within the family unit.[12]

There are many other factors which affect the performance of these children. Few other children are born into the extreme poverty level which marks the birth of a child who has migrant parents. Migrancy compounds the usual problems of poverty and Mexican-American migrants are the poorest of the poor.

These children are also affected by diseases which have been eradicated in most other areas of the culture: rickets, scurvy, pinworms, anemia, and malnutrition.[13] Skin and scalp ailments are seen frequently. Tuberculosis is not uncommon in some areas. Broken bones that have not been set, chronic infections, and intestinal parasites may be found. Sight and hearing loses need correction. Teeth frequently are abscessed or in need of fillings, and in many instances require extensive treatment.[14]

Even if the migrant child is anxious to attend school, there are problems involved. In many homes there are not enough clothes to wear to school. In addition, migrant students have problems participating in extracurricular

activities at school. Many students' families are not economically able to provide instruments for band, tennis shoes for basketball, or cheerleaders' uniforms for cheerleading. Migrant students' participation is further limited by the necessity of helping their families with financial concerns. Furthermore, the school year and the migrant year do not coincide. It has been estimated that these students can not attend two of the eight months of the regular school year.

The educational problems of these students are formidable. For instance, the state of Texas conducted a survey of its migrant students to determine how many of them withdrew from school before they graduated. The results indicated that 20% of their migrant children had never been entered in school.[15]

One study in Oklahoma found that only one-third of the migrant adults could read or write English and less than one-half could read or write Spanish.[16] The adults in this situation are virtually unable to assist their children in the school environment.

> If one had the task of identifying the most educationally disadvantaged group of youngsters in the United States, the ones who under-perform all other groups enrolled in school, who have the highest school dropout rate, who have the lowest academic achievement level and highest number of school failures, no doubt the group readily identified would be the children of migrant agricultural families.[17]

National Commitment to Migrant Education

The United States government has not always been cognizant of the needs of migrant children. The national commitment began in the 1960's. Before that time religious organizations such as the National Friends Society, National Council of Churches, and the Catholic Rural Life Conference provided the only help that was available to migrant workers. This included day care centers and part time summer schools. In the 1960's the federal government offically recognized migrancy as a national and not solely local or state problem. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare then began attempting to formulate an educational concept which would have a positive effect upon the career and educational goals of migrant students.

Migrant Education Programs have as one of their priorities continuity of instruction. One of the ways of assuring this continuity is by use of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) which is a central computer bank located in Little Rock, Arkansas. This data center takes information which is supplied by terminals in the various states and keeps an individual record of each migrant child. Arrival, departure, attendance, academic progress, and health data follow each student. This facilitates school attendance and academic progress by minimizing school bureaucratic problems and increasing time

in class. A child diagnosed in California as having auditory perception problems has a better chance of receiving appropriate treatment quickly when he or she arrives in Colorado. As one state official commented, "...the migrant child who gets his eyes checked in Texas and moves to Washington can get the prescribed glasses there because MSRTS has his complete record sent in a matter of hours."[18] In fact, the MSRTS system has the potential for saving lives. In 1973 it was found that a group of over two hundred children had been exposed to typhoid fever. Using the computer these children were located.[19]

Funding for the Migrant Education Program originates from the Federal Government, under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which was designed to help educationally deprived children. This act was amended by Public Law 89-750 in 1966 to include the children of migratory agricultural workers. Public Law 93-380 (Part 116d) of 1974 further amended it to include children of migratory fishermen and to require the use of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System. Public Law 95-561 in November, 1978, amended the act even further to clarify existing provisions. Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35, is the current federal authorization for providing services to migrant children.

From the federal level, funds are passed to the various State Departments of Education, and from there, disbursed to the local units. Each local project must submit an application to the state for approval.

The money generated depends upon two factors:

1. The number of migrant students ages five through 17 who are identified and which the State Terminal Operator enrolls into the National MSRTS.
2. The number of state residency days (during the calendar year) or full time equivalent days among five through 17 year old migratory children.[20]

Each state has the flexibility to decide how their funds will be disbursed, and to make arrangements to serve their unique population in the most appropriate manner. A study was done in which questionnaires were sent to all 50 states. Four state directors did not reply. However, respondents indicated that they defined their migrant population according to federal regulations. The areas which respondents stated were most important were basic skills, medical needs, and nutritional needs. Other frequently voiced concerns were: credit accrual for graduation, continuity of educational experience, self-acceptance and acceptance by others, staff development, attention to individual needs, and the importance of defining needs locally.

In fiscal year 1982 the Oklahoma Migrant Education Program was implemented by 34 local education agencies located in 12 counties. The 12 counties were: Caddo,

Cimarron, Cotton, Custer, Greer, Harmon, Jackson, Jefferson, Kiowa, McClain, Tillman, and Washita. (See map in Appendix).

Educational and supportive services were provided for approximately 5000 migrant students in fiscal year 1982. Fiscal year 1981 funds in the amount of $356,474 and fiscal year 1982 funds in the amount of $1,559,084 were expended for program operation.[21]

Migrant Education and Social Mobility of Migrant Students

The Migrant Education Program is one of the largest and fastest growing programs administered by the Department of Education. Program funding has more than doubled in the last six years. During fiscal year 1981, about 577,000 students were counted as eligible for program services and were being served at over 21,000 elementary and secondary schools through 3,100 projects.[22] Therefore, it is imperative to assess the impact that the program is having on the students it is serving.

The following interview results reported in Tables 1, 2, and 3 are an attempt to examine the effect Migrant Education has had on the educational, occupational, and income level aspirations of migrant students in a Migrant Education Program in the state of Oklahoma.

Table 1

Parent Interview

1.	Where were you born?	In-State 3	Out-of-State 7	
2.	What is your religious preference?	Protestant 5	Catholic 5	
3.	How many children do you have?	Mean Response 6		
4.	In which racial/ethnic category do you belong?	Spanish/or Mexican Amer. 10		
5.	What was the last grade you completed in school?	Mean Response 5.2		
6.	What is the occupation of the head of the household?	Blue Collar 1	Farm Labor 6	Other 3
7.	Was your total family income last year more than or less than $25,000?	Under $15,000 8	$15,000-$24,999 2	
8.	Do you expect your children to make more or less than $25,000 per year?	Under 15 3	15-24,999 5	25-39,999 2
9.	Are you 18-29, 30-49, 50-64, 65 or more years of age?	18-29 2	30-49 7	50-64 1
10.	Do you feel the school and teachers are interested in your children?	Yes 10	No 0	
11.	How often do you visit the school?	Mean Response 5 times a yr.		

12.	With whom do you visit?	Migrant T. 6	Regular T. 3	Couns. 1
13.	Do you feel it is important for your children to complete high school?	Yes 10	No 0	
14.	Do you want your child to go to vocational school or college?	Yes 10	No 0	
15.	What do you expect the school (education) to do for your children?	Basic Skills 6	Career Ed. 4	
16.	Would you like for the school to offer bilingual instruction in the Migrant Program?	Yes 2	No 8	
17.	Sex of respondent:	Female 10	Male 0	

Table 2

Student Interview

1.	How old are you?	Mean Response 16	
2.	Where were you born?	In-State 5	Out-of-State 5
3.	Sex of respondent:	Female 6	Male 4
4.	In which racial/ethnic category do you belong?	Spanish/Mexican Amer. 9	White 1
5.	What is your religious preference?	Protestant 4	Catholic 5
		No-Pref. 1	
6.	How many brothers/sisters do you have?	Mean Response 4.9	
7.	Have any of your brothers/sisters attended a vocational school/college?	Yes 2	No 8
8.	How many school systems other than Snyder have you attended?	Mean Response 1.8	
9.	What is the educational level of your parents?	Mean Response 6.5	
10.	Which subject do you like best in high school?	Typing, Home Econ., Carpentry	
11.	Which subject do you like least in high school?	English 5	History 5

12.	Do you feel as though teachers took/take an interest in you at school?	Yes 8	No 1	D/K 1
13.	Are there any special programs which have helped you in high school?	Migrant Program 10		
14.	How many children do you plan to have?	Mean Response 2.4		
15.	What type of occupation do you plan to enter?	White Collar 7	Blue Collar 2	F.L. 1
16.	Of the following people, which ones would you say have helped you the most in deciding on a post-secondary goal?	Counselor 1	Migrant T. 6	Reg. T. 3
17.	Was your total family income last year more than or less than $25,000.	Under $15,000 7	$15,000-$24,999 3	
18.	What is the occupation of the head of the household?	Blue Collar 2	Farm L. 5	Other 3
19.	In which of the following income categories do you hope to belong?	Under 14 2	15-24+ 3	25-39+ 4	40+ 1

Table 3

Teacher Interview

		Migrant T.			Regular T.		
		Yes	No	Dep.	Yes	No	Dep.
1.	Do migrant students perform academically as well as non-migrant students?	-	2	2	-	4	-
2.	Are your migrant students more or less cooperative than your non-migrant students?	2	1	1	3	-	1
3.	Are your migrant students more or less independent in school work than non-migrant students?	-	-	4	-	-	4
4.	How many of your migrant students do you expect to graduate from high school?		81%			61%	
5.	How many of your migrant students do you expect to go on to vocational school/college?		24%			4%	
6.	Do your migrant students participate in extracurricular activities?	4	-	-	3	1	-
7.	Do you feel migrant students have a positive self-concept?	2	2	-	2	2	-
8.	Would you prefer to keep migrants students in your regular classroom or refer them for migrant program services?	4	-	-	4	-	-

9.	Do you feel the parents of migrant students are interested in and supportive of their children's education?	4	-	-	3	1	-
10.	How many contacts per year do you have with parents of your migrant students?	288			7		
11.	How many of your migrant students would you predict will be professionals?	2.5%			-		
12.	How many of your migrant students would you predict will be white collar workers?	14%			10%		
13.	How many of your migrant students would you predict will be blue collar workers?	49%			26%		
14.	How many of your migrant students would you predict will be farm laborers?	35%			60%		

		Under $15,000	
15.	In which of the following categories do you feel your migrant students' families belong?	4	4

		Under $15,000	$15-24,999
16.	Which income category do you predict your migrant students will belong in as adults?	7	1

Summary

Only 30% of the migrant parents were born in the state of Oklahoma while 50% of the migrant students were born in-state. This evidence implies a trend toward less mobility on the part of the migrant families interviewed.

Religious preference between students and parents was the same. Fifty percent of each category preferred the Catholic religion. However, the average number of children per migrant family was six (varying from a high of 12 to a low of four). When a projective question of "How many children do you plan to have?" was addressed to students the mean response was 2.4. This deliberate deviation from the religious teaching of the Catholic faith is significant. These students are definitely planning to limit the size of their families, and the pervasive reason appeared to be economically based. This was evidenced by responses such as, "Hard to support too many kids," "Want them to have more," etc.

The average educational level of migrant parents was 5.2 years; however, 16% of the parents interviewed had never attended school. The average educational level of migrant students interviewed was 10.4 (ranging from grade seven to first year in college). These students have doubled the educational level of their parents.

Sixty-six percent of the parents interviewed were in the farm labor occupational group; whereas, only 10% of students selected farm labor as their occupational choice. The data indicated students' occupational expectation level surpassed that of their parents.

Eighty percent of the parents interviewed fell in the under $15,000 income bracket, while only 20% of students predicted they would belong in this category. Thus, 80% of the students projected they would attain a higher level of income than their parents.

Question number 13, on the Parent Interview, "Do you feel it is important for your children to complete high school?" elicited a strong, emotional response of "Yes" (emphasized by "Not let dropout," and "Oh, Yea!"). The response to Question 14, "Do you want your child to go to vocational school or college?" was more ambigious. Although all responses were affirmative, less emphasis was noted with responses ranging from ("Definitely") to ("I want them to go") to ("Hope they will.") In response to "What do you expect the school (education) to do for your children?" 60% of the parents wanted the school to emphasize the basic skills (particularly reading) and 40% expected the school to concentrate on career education.

Lastly, the parents interviewed appeared to emphasize and encourage acculturation of their children into the mainstream of society for their success and achievement.

This is supported by 80% of the parents who responded to the interview stating that they did not desire a bilingual instructional program. All parents stressed they speak English at home. This response appears to contradict the currently held view that Hispanics are deeply concerned about their children being taught in Spanish as well as English.

The Migrant students interviewed reported preferring skills courses such as typing, home economics, and carpentry as opposed to academic subjects such as English and history. The fact that achievement test scores indicate that many of these students are two or more years below grade level expectancy in reading may account for their dislike for subjects requiring reading skills.[23]

Student response to question 13 on the Student Interview is significant in documenting the positive effect of the Migrant Program experienced by these students. All 10 students interviewed (100%) indicated that the Migrant Education Program was the special program that had helped them in school.

In addition, 60% of the students chose the migrant teacher in response to question 16, 30% selected a regular teacher, and 10% the counselor. The student that indicated the counselor to have been of most help in deciding on a post-secondary goal was a former student who graduated last year and is currently attending college.

The Teacher Interviews were evidenced by regular teachers manifesting lower expectations for migrant students than those espoused by migrant teachers. The lowered expectations from regular teachers could have a "Pygmalion Effect" or encourage a self-fulfilling prophecy on migrant students. Furthermore, 50% of the migrant teachers stated that migrant students did not perform as well as non-migrant students, but regular teachers reported 100% performed lower.

On the question referring to the cooperativeness of migrant students 50% of the migrant teachers and 100% of the regular teachers agreed that it was entirely dependent upon the individual student. The recognition of individual differences without regard to migrant or non-migrant status is notable.

In reference to the independence question, the consensus response of both migrant and regular teachers was that these students are less independent in school work than non-migrant students. This response is supported by Kagan and Buriel's (1977) paper, "Field Dependence-Independence and Mexican American Culture and Education." The general thrust of the field dependence-independence research on Hispanic children has been that Hispanic children (tending to be more field dependent) prefer social cooperation and nonanalytic strategies of thought and problem solving in educational interactions. Conversely, Anglo children

(tending to be more field independent) stress competition, independence, and more use of analytic modes of thought in school interactions.

Migrant teachers indicated slightly higher participation of migrant students in extracurricular activities than did regular teachers. However, both groups appeared ambivalent in regard to whether or not migrant students possess a positive self concept. Responses of migrant teachers were 25% "Yes," 25% "Depends," and 50% "No." Regular teachers were evenly divided between "Yes" and "No."

The common response given by all teachers on question 8 was refer to the Migrant Program if the student needs the services of the program. Referral seemed to be based on individual student needs for both groups of teachers.

One hundred percent of the migrant teachers interviewed responded that the parents of migrant children are interested in and supportive of their children's education. Seventy-five percent of the regular teachers agreed but 25% disagreed.

Migrant teachers consistently had higher expectations for migrant students to graduate from high school, to attend college or vocational school, and to enter professional, blue collar, and white collar occupations as evidenced by their responses on the Teacher Interviews. Migrant teachers

further evidenced slightly higher expectations for these students future income level than regular teachers.

A significant finding of the Teacher Interviews is that out of 96 eligible migrant students; migrant teachers had 288 contacts during a school year with these students' parents. Regular teachers reported only seven contacts. Migrant teachers parental contact was 41 times greater than that of regular teachers.

The implications derived from the interviews that were conducted indicate the Migrant Education Program in the Snyder Public Schools does have an effect on the upward social mobility of migrant students. The interviews documented that migrant students surpassed the educational level of their parents, and projected a higher income and occupational level for themselves than their parents. Thus, according to Prichard and Buxton's definition of social class migrant students have ascended upward.[24]

Furthermore, the socialization factors affecting migrant students' schooling suggests that regular teachers' stereotypical beliefs about the cultural attributes of migrant students may lead to lowered educational expectations for these students.[25] In many educational institutions, income or socioeconomic status seems to predict "success" in the institution as well as "success" in being well socialized. Oftentimes, schools tend to enforce sterotypes through the hidden curriculum. For example, in a

major study of Mexican American education at the fourth, eighth, tenth, and twelfth grades, the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1973) found that teacher-student communication paterns were distinctly different for Hispanic versus Anglo students.26 The results of this study suggest that the qualitative character of communicative participation and opportunity to learn in classroom settings was distinctly inferior for Mexican American students.

Migrant teachers' educational expectations for migrant students were consistently higher than regular teachers. This higher level of teacher expectations could be based on closer interaction with students, smaller classes, individualized instruction, extensive contact with parents, awareness of migrant students' background characteristics, and/or a special empathy and rapport with these students.

A final conclusion to be drawn is that more needs to be understood about how school institutional factors, such as teacher selection and teacher training, counseling resources for students, racial and socioeconomic integration of schools affect migrant students' educational, occupational and socioeconomic attainment. Evidence suggests adequate school resources, a hospitable school climate, and sensitivity of school staff to migrant students' background characteristics may be critical in optimizing their school achievement.27

Appendix

Snyder Public Schools
Enrollment By Grade Levels
1970-1984

Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Elem. Total	7	8	9	Jr.H. Total	10	11	12	Sr.H. Total	School Total
1983-84	52	48	53	43	39	35	40	310	55	33	36	124	32	33	27	92	526
1982-83	40	45	47	35	36	32	52	287	29	38	34	101	39	22	34	95	483
1981-82	27	36	28	26	31	44	23	215	34	23	33	90	22	28	37	87	392
1980-81	34	26	31	31	40	20	33	215	22	32	24	78	35	35	41	111	404
1979-80	25	35	35	40	21	40	18	214	25	23	29	77	34	36	37	107	398
1978-79	29	38	35	25	37	17	28	209	21	32	32	85	40	46	41	127	421
1977-78	25	35	36	42	22	40	22	222	28	25	31	84	45	50	32	127	443
1976-77	37	32	38	26	28	30	36	227	28	42	48	118	53	32	43	128	473
1975-76	41	41	26	28	29	34	31	230	45	45	54	144	33	47	47	127	501
1974-75	46	33	28	29	37	36	41	250	49	54	26	139	39	43	32	114	503
1973-74	30	30	38	30	30	33	46	227	58	32	44	134	40	37	36	113	474
1972-73	29	32	32	28	36	40	54	251	44	43	41	128	41	41	35	117	496
1971-72	30	30	32	36	39	46	45	158	39	35	45	119	37	39	37	113	490
1970-71	--	34	34	42	44	40	45	239	41	50	39	130	48	36	27	111	480

Migrant Enrollment

Year	Students	Percent Of Total Enrollment
1983-84	96	18%
1982-83	120	24%
1981-82	113	28%
1980-81	100	24%
1979-80	91	22%
1978-79	72	17%
1977-78	61	14%
1976-77	42	8%
1975-76	35	6%
1974-75	27	5%

OKLAHOMA MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

FY 1982

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OKLAHOMA

COUNTIES

Caddo	Jackson
Cimarron	Jefferson
Cotton	Kiowa
Custer	McClain
Greer	Tillman
Harmon	Washita

PROJECTS

1. Altus
2. Arnett
3. Binger
4. Blair
5. Boise City
6. Burns Flat
7. Butler
8. Clinton
9. Custer
10. Davidson
11. Eakly
12. Eldorado
13. Felt
14. Frederick
15. Gould
16. Grandfield
17. Granite
18. Hobart
19. Hollis
20. Lookeba-Sickles
21. Mangum
22. Martha
23. Mt. Park
24. Olustee
25. Oney-Albert
26. Ryan
27. Sentinel
28. Snyder
29. Southside
30. Temple
31. Terral
32. Washington
33. Waurika
34. Weaver

Footnotes

1. Keith W. Prichard and Thomas H. Buxton, Concepts and Theories in Sociology of Education, (Lincoln, Nebraska; Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1973), p. 67.

2. David R. Morgan, Ph.D., Director Bureau of Government Research, The University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

3. Lloyd W. Warner and Paul S. Lunt, The Status Systems of a Modern Community, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), Chapter 1.

4. Marvin Bressler, "Sociology and Collegiate General Education," in Paul Lazarsfeld et al. (eds.), The Uses of Sociology, (New York: Basic Books, 1967), pp. 46-48.

5. Richard P. Duran, Hispanics' Education and Background,(New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1983), p. 4.

6. National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Make Something Happen, (Washington, D.C.: Hispanic Policy Development Project, 1984), p. 3.

7. United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: "Population Characteristics," Series P-20, Number 361, Washington, D.C., 1981.

8. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics. "Place of Birth and Language Characteristics of Persons of Hispanic Origin in the United States," Number 78 B-6, Washington, D.C., 1978b.

9. United States Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics. "The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans." Compiled and edited by G.H. Brown; N. Rosen; and M.A. Olivas, Washington, D.C., 1980, pp. 138-139.

10. Margaret A. Laughlin, "An Invisible Minority: An Examination of Migrant Education." April 23, 1980. Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Ethnic and Minority Studies, La Crosse, Wisconsin, pp. 2-3.

11. Thomas P. Carter and Roberto D. Segura, Mexican Americans in School: A Decade of Change, New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1979, p. 115.

12. Margaret A. Laughlin, op. cit., p. 3.

13. Margaret A. Laughlin, op. cit., p. 8.

14. Joyce King-Stoops, "Migrant Education: Teaching the Wandering Ones," Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana, 1980, p. 25. ERIC ED 194 262.

15. Margaret A. Laughlin, op. cit., p. 1.

16. Margaret A. Laughlin, op. cit., p. 6.

17. Margaret A. Laughlin, op. cit., p. 2.

18. Thomas P. Carter and Roberto D. Segura, op. cit., pp. 305 and 306.

19. "Title I Migrant Education Program," Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Washington, D.C., 1981, p. 3. ERIC ED 209 031.

20. "The Recruiter's Guidebook for Identification and Recruitment, Revised," Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin, 1980, p. 16. ERIC ED 194 272.

21. Oklahoma Annual Migrant Evaluation Report, Oklahoma State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.

22. "An Analysis of Migration Characteristics of Children Served Under the Migrant Education Program," Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, May 2, 1983, p. 4.

23. DeDe Graham, Migrant Counselor's Guide, Oklahoma State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, OKlahoma, 1983, p. 14.

24. Keith W. Prichard and Thomas H. Buxton, op. cit., p. 7.

25. Richard P. Duran, op. cit., p. 56.

26. The United States Commission on Civil Rights, "Mexican American Education Study, Report 5: Teachers and Students," Washington, D.C., 1973, p. 31.

27. Richard P. Duran, op. cit., p. 57.

Bibliography

"An Analysis of Migration Characteristics of Children Served Under the Migrant Education Program," Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, May 2, 1983.

Bressler, Marvin. "Sociology and Collegiate General Education," in Paul F. Lazarsfeld et al. (eds.), The Uses of Sociology (New York: Basic Books, 1967).

Carter, Thomas P. and Segura, Roberto D. Mexican Americans in School: A Decade of Change (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1979).

Duran, Richard P. Hispanics' Education and Background College Entrance Examination Board (New York: 1983).

Graham, DeDe. Migrant Counselor's Guide Oklahoma State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1983.

Kagan, S., and Buriel, R., "Field Dependence-Independence and Mexican American Culture and Education," in J. Martinez, Jr. (ed.), Chicano Psychology (New York: Academic Press, 1977).

King-Stoops, Joyce. "Migrant Education: "Teaching the Wandering Ones," Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana, 1980.

Laughlin, Margaret A. "An Invisible Minority: An Examination of Migrant Education." April 23, 1980. Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Ethnic and Minority Studies, La Crosse, Wisconsin.

National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics. Make Something Happen (Washington, D.C.: Hispanic Policy Development Project, 1984).

Oklahoma Annual Migrant Evaluation Report. Oklahoma State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1982.

Prichard, Keith W. and Buxton, Thomas H. Concepts and Theories in Sociology of Education (Lincoln, Nebraska, Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1973.)

"The Recruiter's Guidebook for Identification and Recruitment, Revised," Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin, 1980.

"Title I Migrant Education Program," Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Washington, D.C., 1981.

United States Commission on Civil Rights, "Teachers and Students, Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students," Report V: Mexican American Education Study, Washington, D.C., 1973.

United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: "Population Characteristics," Series P-20, Number 361, Washington, D.C., 1981.

United States Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics. "The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans." Compiled and edited by G.H. Brown; N. Rosen; and M.A. Olivas, Washington, D.C., 1980.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics. "Place of Birth and Language Characteristics of Persons of Hispanic Origin in the United States, Number 78 B-6, Washington, D.C., 1978b.

Warner, Lloyd W. and Lunt, Paul S. The Status Systems of a Modern Community (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942.)